

# **CALIFORNIA INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Meeting Minutes Summary  
Wednesday, January 29, 2003  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
400 "R" Street  
Sacramento, California**

**Committee Members Present:**

VICTOR WEISSER, CHAIR  
NORM COVELL  
DENNIS DeCOTA  
BRUCE HOTCHKISS  
SHELDON KAMIENIECKI  
ROBERT PEARMAN  
RICHARD SKAGGS  
JEFFREY WILLIAMS

**Committee Members Absent:**

ELIZABETH DEAKIN  
JAMES LENTS

**Motions:**

1. A motion was made by Member Kamieniecki and seconded by Member Covell to approve the Meeting Minutes Summary for the December 13, 2002 meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.
2. A motion was made by Member Kamieniecki and seconded by Member Skaggs to place a draft of the meeting minutes summary on the IMRC web site for public review at the same time the draft is distributed to IMRC members. The original motion was amended as moved by Chair Weisser and seconded by Member Kamieniecki to provide that the final adopted meeting minutes summary would also be added to the web site after their adoption. The amended motion was voted upon and adopted, with seven members voting for the motion and one member (DeCota) voting against.
3. Chair Weisser opened the nomination process for selecting a Vice-Chair of the IMRC to act in the absence of the Chair. Member DeCota nominated Member Covell and no other nominations were made. Member Covell was then unanimously approved to act as the Vice-Chair for the IMRC.

4. Chair Weisser presented a proposed Mission Statement for the IMRC. Following discussion and minor modifications, the Mission Statement was approved unanimously as follows:

### **Inspection and Maintenance Review Committee**

#### **Mission Statement**

The Inspection and Maintenance Review Committee (IMRC) is an advisory body established to review and evaluate the vehicle inspection and maintenance program and to recommend program improvements to the Administration and the Legislature in a timely manner.

The goals of the IMRC are to report to the Administration and Legislature on program performance and to identify and recommend methods to ensure that the program is:

Effective in achieving emission reductions needed to meet clean air standards;  
Efficient in terms of achieving emission reductions with the least possible costs to individual participants and society as a whole and equitable in terms of the allocation of these costs;  
Fair to stakeholders including motorists, vehicle inspection and repair service providers, as well as the public at large.

5. Chair Weisser presented a draft duty statement for the position of Executive Officer for the IMRC. Member DeCota made a motion to accept the Executive Officer duty statement as written and Member Kamieniecki seconded the motion. After discussion and minor modification of the proposed duty statement, the motion to adopt the duty statement was unanimously.
6. Member Kamieniecki made a motion to select a subcommittee of two to act as an ad hoc search committee for an Executive Officer, and that the sub-committee consist of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the IMRC. The sub-committee would report back on a regular basis to the full IMRC as to their progress and bring their recommended candidates back to the full IMRC for review, interview and selection. The motion was seconded by Member DeCota and was unanimously approved.

#### **Other Discussion Items:**

1. A discussion was held relating to the current tape recording system used for IMRC meetings. Chair Weisser indicated that staff has been asked to look into the options available for new transportable recording system that would be more sensitive in regard to the pickup of input from both IMRC members and the public. Target date for availability of tapes will be three business days following the meeting. Tapes of the meetings, as well as, printed transcripts of the meetings, will be available to the public upon request for a reasonable fee.
2. Staff was asked to research the feasibility of creating an e-mail list for notification of meetings and report back to the IMRC with a proposal.

3. The IMRC decided that as soon as staff is hired they will be directed to establish/update a website for the IMRC. This might be accomplished by the hiring of an outside consultant to set-up and maintain an independent website.
4. The Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), Kathleen Hamilton, was introduced to the IMRC. Director Hamilton welcomed everyone to DCA and congratulated the members on their appointments. Director Hamilton thanked the IMRC for their willingness to work with BAR and the Administration and for giving their best thoughts, guidance, advice and counsel on the wide range of issues associated with the Smog Check program. Director Hamilton then talked about DCA's ongoing review of its complaint disclosure policies and BAR's utilization of a process known as "Notice of Violation". Director Hamilton discussed an effort by some segments of the auto repair industry to establish a board to conduct regulatory activities associated to the auto repair industry. Lastly, Director Hamilton suggested the IMRC at this time not curtail its efforts to meet its statutory responsibilities because of the current State budget problems and that the DCA was ready and able to help the IMRC in this regard.
5. Chair Weisser announced the schedule of upcoming meetings. Meetings will be held on February 26<sup>th</sup> at the Department of Consumer Affairs, 400 "R" Street, Sacramento, California; March 26th at the City Hall Council Chambers on 1333 Park Avenue in Emeryville, California; and April 23rd at the Junipero Serra State Building on 340 West Fourth Street in Los Angeles. Meetings are scheduled for 9:30 to 4:00 p.m.
6. The next item of discussion was the focus and priorities for the IMRC. Mr. Tom Cackette, Acting Executive Director of the Air Resources Board and Mr. Patrick Dorais, Acting Chief for the Bureau of Automotive Repair presented their suggested priorities as follows:
  - a. Analyze the effect of the improved I&M Program on motor vehicle emissions and air quality.
  - b. Gathering, analysis and evaluation of information.
  - c. Consultations with other state agencies, with CHP, DMV, ARB and BAR.
  - d. Annual reports to the Legislature and the Governor. One report is to quantify the emission reductions that are occurring and to quantify the improvement in air quality. One other report is to review work that ARB and BAR are doing.
  - e. ARB and BAR have three reports that are required by the California Legislature, that are all due January of 2003 (there is also a biennial report due to the USEPA dealing with the SIP). The first one they are also required to send to the IMRC concerns emission reductions, the impact of exemptions on the program's effectiveness, and the impact of the four-year exemption for new vehicles, along with recommendations for improvement. The two other reports are to be made to the Legislature (not directly to the IMRC) and these have very similar objectives to the first report plus providing recommendations on a new program to replace the existing program.
  - f. Focus on getting an Executive Officer and support staff.
7. The following bullet points are suggestions from both the committee and the public on areas of focus and priorities.
  1. Annual report to Governor/Legislature.
  2. Quantify emission reductions.
  3. Quantify improvement in air quality.
  4. Evaluate reports submitted by ARB/BAR, including suggested program modifications.

5. Gold Shield Program.
6. Consumer Assistance Program.
7. Scrappage Credit programs.
8. Limiting vehicle exemptions.
9. Emission control equipment warranties.
10. Evaluation of High Emitter Profile program (HEP).
11. Public information on car emission control equipment performance.
12. Cost and consumer acceptance.
13. Public/Private partnership.
14. Station performance - compare Test-Only, Gold Shield and Test and Repair stations.
15. Bay Area enhanced program rollout - technician and equipment availability.
16. Percentage of vehicles directed to test-only.
17. New technologies.
18. 30 year rolling exemption.
19. Exemption for collector cars through a new vehicle waiver/exemption process.
20. Enforcement: are failing cars being repaired or removed from fleet?
21. Examine issue of "lost cars" (i.e. cars that fail their test and "disappear" from the system).
22. Subsidies for cost effective repairs costing more than the existing cut off point.
23. Roadside testing.
24. Test-Only no-show rate.
25. "SB 42 takeaway".
26. 6 year new car exemption (cost effectiveness and impact on achieving air quality goals).
27. Pollution credits: "Natural" scrappage vs. "forced" scrappage.
28. Provide accurate numbers on cars directed to Test-Only vs. Test and Repair.
29. Equipment requirements in Bay Area.
30. Organizational structure in Smog Check Program (who is responsible for what?)
31. Verify 36% Test-Only directed.
32. Examine appropriateness of cut points.
33. SB 285 Mountjoy (1999).
34. A quality audit to improve Smog Check Program performance.
35. A Smog check post-test flag that would be displayed after a smog test is performed.
36. Create exhaust opacity standards to reduce particulate matter emissions.
37. Evaluation of the ancillary benefits of Smog Check.
38. Create vehicles specific emissions standards to improve fairness and performance.
39. Require all persons performing Smog checks to be licensed (i.e. fleets that perform their own tests).
40. Enforcement (e.g. on cars that slip by requirements via false registration locations).
41. Require Smog checks to be performed by providers who do not have an ownership interest in the car being tested.
42. Evaluate the level of unlicensed Smog Check repairs provided for pay and develop an audit procedure to improve compliance with the licensing rule.

Prior to meeting adjournment, Chair Weisser indicated that this list was preliminary and that other ideas were welcome. He indicated the next meeting would be focused on completing the list, ensuring best possible understanding of the ideas on the list, and prioritizing of these potential areas of focus.